



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,635	01/24/2001	Michael J. Cafarella	TEL-015	5300

24488 7590 02/11/2005

BEVER, HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP  
1432 CONCANNON BLVD  
BLDG G  
LIVERMORE, CA 94550-6006

EXAMINER

LIEN, TAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,635

Applicant(s)

CAFARELLA ET AL.

Examiner

Tan Lien

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 and 55-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 and 55-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-44 and 55-73 are presented for examination.

Claims 55-61 are amended.

Claims 45-54 are withdrawn.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species 1: claim(s) 42, 43, 44

Species 2: claim(s) 45

Species 3: claim(s) 46

Species 4: claim(s) 47, 48, 49, 50, 51

Species 5: claim(s) 52, 53, 54

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, species 1-5 have claim 41 as generic claim.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

Art Unit: 2141

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Ms. Jeanette S. Harms on 5/10/2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of claims 42-44. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 45-54 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

*Claim(s) 1, 13-14, 23, 40 and 55-62 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padmanabhan et al (US Patent 6,219,638 B1), hereinafter referred to as Padmanabhan, in view of W3C VoiceXML Forum (<http://www.w3.org/TR/2000/NOTE-voicexml-20000505>), hereinafter referred to as VoiceXML Forum.*

Claim(s) 1, 14, 23, 55-62: Padmanabhan discloses a method for providing a telephony session, the method including:

receiving an electronic mail request from a third party to provide the telephony session (col. 3, lines 21-30; wherein the request is in a form of a message send by the email to the message server or an HTTP request to the message server);

calling a customer in accordance with the request triggered by an event (Fig. 1, reference 16, 26, and 12 of Padmanabhan; wherein the figure show the communication is both ways and the Telephony Server is capable of calling the customer via the telephone. Triggering an event is well know in the art. See US Patent 5,526,413 of Cheston, III et al);

responding to an interaction with the customer during the telephony session (col. 3, lines 55-60; wherein the interaction is in the form of tone dialing or verbal response).

Padmanabhan fails to disclose a method that includes accessing a URL providing a VoiceXML application in accordance with the request and running the VoiceXML application when the customer answers. VoiceXML Forum, however, discloses the use of VoiceXML to create audio dialogs that feature synthesized speech, digitized audio, recognition of spoken key input, recording of spoken input, telephony, and mixed-initiative conversations (Abstract section of the document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to run the VoiceXML application on the Speech Synthesis Server (Fig. 1, reference 34) when the customer answer. The motivation for the use of VoiceXML would be to bring the advantages of web-based development and content delivery to interactive voice response applications (Abstract section of the document).

Claim(s) 13, 40: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 1, 23 above, further including

Art Unit: 2141

reformatting the request for processing (col. 3, lines 25-30; wherein the request in the email message has to be formatted in a form where the message server has to understand in order for it to forward it to the telephony server).

*Claim(s) 2-3, 5-12, 15, 17-22, 24-39, 63-64, 66-73 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padmanabhan in view of VoiceXML Forum and further in view of Larsson et al (US Patent 6,643,262 B1), hereinafter referred to as Larsson.*

Claim(s) 2, 25, 63: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 1, 23, 62 respectively above, further including

storing ability in the message server (col. 3, lines 21-23). But Padmanabhan fails to disclose the status of the telephony session for access by the third party.

Larsson, however, discloses the status of the telephony connection changing from active state to paused state (col. 16, lines 55-59 of Larsson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to store telephony connection status information in the message server for access by a third party. The motivation to do so would have been to associate connections to resources and to keep track of the state of the connection to see if it is inactive or paused state for disconnect (col. 16, lines 60-62 of Larsson).

Claim(s) 26: Padmanabhan discloses a system of claim 25 above, wherein the means for

storing comprises a database and a server providing Internet access (Fig. 1, ref. 42; wherein the database is in the message server and the webpage server has to have access to the Internet).

Claim(s) 3, 15, 27, 64: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 1, 14, 23, 62 respectively above, but fails to disclose

monitoring a plurality of telephony servers to determine availability for the telephony session. Larsson, however, discloses the monitoring of telephony connections (col. 2, lines 13-17 and col. 14, lines 66-67 to col. 15, lines 1-6 of Larsson) for non-activity or period of quiescence and disconnect the inactive connections to make them available to the active ones. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to use the message server to monitor a plurality of telephony servers to determine availability for the telephony sessions. The reason why Padmanabhan would want to monitor the telephony connections for inactivity is because Padmanabhan wants to reallocate core resources (returning memory) to other users' or applications' active connections (col. 2, lines 13-17 of Larsson).

Art Unit: 2141

Claim(s) 5, 17, 32, 66: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 3, 15, 27, 64

respectively above, but fails to disclose the

prioritizing a plurality of telephony sessions. Larsson, however, discloses the priority levels assigned to subscribers to control allocations of connection resources (col. 4, lines 36-39 of Larsson; wherein the connection resources are the telephony sessions and the subscribers are the customers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to use a priority mechanism to prioritize telephony sessions in the message server. The motivation would have been to determine a cost for the type of service that is associated to the priority levels (col. 24, lines 62-67 to col. 25, lines 1-8 of Larsson).

Claim(s) 6, 33, 67: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim 3, 27, 64 above, further including

receiving a plurality of requests from a plurality of third parties to provide a plurality of telephony sessions (col. 3, lines 35-37 and line 27 of Padmanabhan; wherein "some" telephone use is indicative of plural telephony sessions and third parties).

Claim(s) 7, 21, 68: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim 6, 20, 67 respectively above, but fails to disclose

plurality of requests are dispatched to the plurality of telephony servers based on a semi-randomized selection process biased toward low load telephony servers. Larsson, however, discloses the use of resources based upon the overall load on the system at any given time, and the selection process biased toward a low load telecommunication system (col. 4, lines 28-35 of Larsson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to dispatched requests to plurality of telephony servers based on a selection process biased toward low load telephony servers. (col. 12, lines 19-21 of Larsson). The reason why Padmanabhan would want to use the selection process based on low load telephony servers is because Padmanabhan wants to make full use of the telecommunication system resources for other users (col. 2, lines 13-17 of Larsson). Making full use of resources leads to a growth of data traffic, which in turn leads to more subscribers, which in turn leads to more dollars for the company (col. 2, lines 18-32).

Claim(s) 8, 22, 35, 69: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 3, 15, 27, 64 respectively above, but fails to disclose

capturing a status of the telephony session. Larsson, however, discloses the status of the telephony connection changing from active state to paused state (col. 16, lines 55-59 of Larsson; wherein the statue is being captured somewhere in order for it to be used to decide to disconnect if at paused state or to stay

connected if at active state). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to capture telephony connection status information in the message server for access. The reason why Padmanabhan wants to capture the status of the connection is because Padmanabhan wants to determine if the status is inactive, and if it is, the system will release resources (inactive channel, col. 16, line 60) back for other users' or applications' use (col. 16, lines 55-62 of Larsson).

Claim(s) 9, 36, 70: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 1, 23, 62 respectively above, but fails to disclose

determining whether the request passes a policy check. Larsson, however, discloses a request for connection service, which is authenticated by checking a list of things (col. 14, lines 48-56 of Larsson; wherein the policy check is checking for subscriber's number and/or PIN code or password). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to determine if the request from the email system (Fig. 1, ref. 18 of Padmanabhan) passes a policy check. The motivation would have been to activate the connection service by first dialing the appropriate dynamic connection service number (col. 14, lines 40-42).

Claim(s) 10, 11, 12, 37, 38, 39, 71, 72, 73: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 9, 36, 70 respectively above, wherein

Art Unit: 2141

the policy check is set by the third party, the customer, and a receiver of the request (col. 14, lines 48-56 of Larsson; wherein the policy check is checking for subscriber's number and/or PIN code or password. Each subscriber has to be able to set one's password in order for them to enter it for authentication, and each subscriber's number, A-number, has to be set for the system to identify each subscriber. There are multiple subscribers, and each has different roles of the third party or the customer, and/or the message server has the role of the receiver of the request).

Claim(s) 18, 24: Padmanabhan discloses a system of claim(s) 15, 23 above, further including

a gateway for receiving a request from the third party to provide the telephony session (col. 3, lines 21-30; wherein the request is in a form of a message send by the email to the message server).

Claim(s) 19: Padmanabhan discloses a system of claim 18, wherein

the request comprises an email (col. 3, lines 21-30; wherein the request is in a form of a message send by the email to the message server).

Claim(s) 20, 28: Padmanabhan discloses a system of claim(s) 15, 27 above, wherein the

event queue interface includes a plurality of event queue servers for receiving a plurality of requests from a plurality of third parties to provide a plurality of telephony sessions (Fig. 1, ref. 12; wherein the message servers are the queue servers. It is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art to grow more servers as more requests and applications grow).

Claim(s) 34: Padmanabhan discloses a system of claim 33 above, wherein the means for receiving a plurality of requests includes

a plurality of HTML servers (Fig. 1, ref. 42 of Padmanabhan and col. 5, lines 30-34).

*Claim(s) 4, 16, 29-31, 65 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padmanabhan in view of VoiceXML Forum, and further in view of Larsson and Servi et al (US Patent 5,381,546), hereinafter referred to as Servi.*

Claim(s) 4, 16, 29, 65: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim(s) 3, 15, 27, 64 respectively above, but fails to include

scheduling the telephony session for a predetermined time. Servi, however, discloses scheduling of the performance of different types of tasks having different priorities (col. 3, lines 43-45 of Servi). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to use the message server to schedule telephony session. The reason for

Art Unit: 2141

Padmanabhan's method to schedule the different types of tasks having different priority classes is to control the allocation of service among classes of requests for service (col. 3, lines 41-43 of Servi).

Claim(s) 30, 31: Padmanabhan discloses a system of claim 29, 29 respectively above, wherein

the means for scheduling includes a database regarding the customer (Fig. 1, ref. 14, 18 and 42; wherein the scheduling is done by the message server and the database storing the schedule information is in the message server, email server, and web server).

*Claim(s) 41-44 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padmanabhan in view of Bowman-Amuah (US Patent 6,578,068 B1).*

Claim(s) 41: Padmanabhan discloses a method of allowing an intermediate party to facilitate an interactive telephony session between a third party and a customer, the method comprising:

receiving an electronic request for the interactive telephony session from the third party (col. 3, lines 21-30; wherein the request is in a form of a message send by the email to the message server); and

Art Unit: 2141

initiating the interactive telephony session with the customer (col. 3, lines 55-60; wherein the interaction is in the form of tone dialing or verbal response).

Padmanabhan fails to disclose determining if the request passes a policy check, wherein the policy check can be set by the third party, the customer, and the intermediate party. Bowman-Amuah, however, discloses determining if the request passes a policy check, wherein the policy check is set by at least one of the third party, the customer, and the intermediate party (col. 81, lines 50-67 of Bowman-Amuah). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to determine if the electronic request passes a policy check. The reason why Padmanabhan would want to determine if the request passes a policy check is because Padmanabhan wants prevent intrusions and to protect private networks connecting telephony systems (col. 81, lines 60-62).

Claim(s) 42: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim 41 above, but fails to disclose that the policy check includes confirming required resources.

Bowman-Amuah, however, discloses confirming required resources wherein the required resources are email attachments with MIME standard (col. 74, lines 5-15 of Bowman-Amuah). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to use the policy check that includes email attachments' information with the request. The reason why Padmanabhan

Art Unit: 2141

would want to use a policy check that includes an email attachment with MIME standard is because Padmanabhan wants to secure the email attachment, which in turn protects the request from an unintended source.

Claim(s) 43: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim 42, but fails to disclose the determining of whether an associated file is attached to the request.

Bowman-Amuah, however, discloses a scrambled message as part of a request requiring the username and password (col. 83, lines 14-20 of Bowman-Amuah; wherein the associated file is the scrambled message containing the username and password, and if the username and password are part of a request it has to be attached to the request). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Padmanabhan to determine if the scrambled message containing the username and password is attached to the request. The reason why Padmanabhan would want to use the scrambled message containing a username and password attached to the request is because this mechanism provides a level of security for the attachment and the request (col. 83, lines 14-20 of Bowman-Amuah).

Claim(s) 44: Padmanabhan discloses a method of claim 42, wherein

confirming required resources includes determining whether an associated file is referenced in the request (This claim is rejected under the same basis as claim 43. When the file is associated to the request, it is referencing the request).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10/04/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the Remarks,

(A) Applicant argued that the passage (col. 3, lines 21-30) fails to teach anything regarding such an email including a request from a third party to provide the telephony session, and consequently fails to teach calling the customer in accordance with the request.

As to point (A), by just looking at Fig. 1, one of ordinary skill in the art would agree that the email system (ref. 18) is capable of sending and receiving an electronic mail message containing text instruction to set up a telephony session from anyone including a "third party." Once one of ordinary skill opens the email message containing text instruction, then providing a telephony session is a matter of having a telephony user set up the telephony session to communicate with the customer, which Padmanabhan's telephone messaging system is clearly capable of. Claim 1 is so broad that it clearly falls within the interpretation of a lot of prior arts including Padmanabhan in view of Forum, and therefore, the rejection stays.

Art Unit: 2141

(B) Applicant argued that Larsson does not teach the feature recited in claim 2, "storing the status of the telephony session for access by the third party."

As to point (B), Padmanabhan and Larsson teach the storing ability, and Larsson clearly state the status of the telephony connection changing from active state to paused state. The status has to be able to be accessed by a user in order for the user to know the change of connection state. If one does not have access to the state information then one would not be about to tell that the state has changed.

(C) Applicant argued that Padmanabhan fail to disclose or suggest "receiving a plurality requests from a plurality of third parties to provide a plurality of telephony sessions."

As to point (C), the reference does teach the limitation above. The email system is capable of receiving a plurality of requests, and the telephony server is capable of providing a plurality of telephony sessions. It is evident from Fig. 1 that the Telephony Server is capable of multiple telephony sessions by looking at the two-way arrows in which the Telephony Server is communicating with.

(D) Applicant argued that Larsson does not teach in the passage (col. 14, lines 48-56) "determining whether the request passes a policy check."

As to point (D), in the passage, the passing of the policy check is the passing of the authentication check, more specifically the password check. The authentication check is an instance of the policy check.

(E) Applicant argued how a subscription service can call a "customer" in accordance with the request from the "third party" and run a VoiceXML application when the customer answers, and what element in Larsson constitutes the message server?

As to point (E), the Office Action never stated that Larson teaches the electronic mail request passing a policy. The Office Action state that Padmanabhan teaches receiving an electronic mail request from a third party and Larsson teaches passing a policy set by the subscribers. Padmanabhan and Larsson, in combination, teach the electronic mail request passing a policy. Padmanabhan, Forum, and Larsson all together teach all the features of the invention claimed in claims 9-12. The subscription service doesn't call the "customer," the system of Padmanabhan, Larsson, and Forum does.

(F) Applicant argued that "wherein the telephone server configurably receives an incoming call from a second customer" is not addressed in claim 14.

As to point (F), the Office Action may not explicitly state the telephone server receives an incoming call from a second customer, but it is implicitly addressed in claims 1 and 14 by referring to the Fig. 1, which clearly shows two-way communications among other components and the telephone server. It is obvious, logical, and well known in the art that if the telephone server is capable of receiving an incoming call from a customer, then it is capable of receiving an

incoming call from a second customer as the evidence is obvious in Fig. 1.

Padmanabhan substantially shows that the Telephony Server is capable of receiving text and convert it to speech and vice versa, and interact with the first customer and second customer and so forth.

(G) Applicant argued that the reference to a customer database or a database provided by a third party cannot be found in Padmanabhan.

As to point (G), it is very clear that the customer database exists in the Email system and the Web page system. A database must exist in order to store customer and third party messages (Fig. 1).

(H) Applicant argued that Bowman-Amuah fails to teach the flexibility of policy check determination step, specifically the determining if the request passes a policy check, wherein the policy check can be set by the third party, the customer, and the intermediate party.

As to point (H), Bowman-Amuah does teach various policies (business policy (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under "So what is the right size for a Business Component?" section), authentication policy, firewall policy, access policy (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under "Authentication 1554"), and more) set by various users of different components. For example, for authentication policy, the system has to check for password to see if the right user is accessing the system. That password is sent by that user. And for a firewall policy, the administrator has to

set the policy for the filter system to check the packets in order for it to go through the firewall. The Examiner's interpretation of Bowman-Amuah's policy check teaching falls well within the scope of the claim.

The Examiner does not think that this invention is mainly about policy checks, for it is already a well-known feature in the art. From the Applicant's specification (mainly paragraphs [0001-0004]) the invention is geared toward allowing a customer to interact with the system once the customer answers the call, which gives the applicant's system a two-way communication. The one-way communication, which is receiving a request to call a customer at a specific time is admitted by the Application to be well known in the prior art described under the section "Discussion of the Related Art," of Applicant's specification.

Applicant's specification state that prior art does not teach two-way communication especially interacting with the system once the call is made to the customer. Contrary to statements in Applicant's specification, Padmanabhan teaches a two-way communication telephony system that allows user interaction (col. 1 lines 55-57 Padmanabhan). Adding features such as a database for the customer and/or "third party" and policy check to the request merely makes the invention more functional and are not inventive steps of the invention.

(I) Applicant's other points are basically a rehash of the address points above.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tan Lien whose telephone number is (703) 305-6018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 6pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [tan.lien@uspto.gov].

Art Unit: 2141

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



**RUPAL DHARIA**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER